DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 373 628 HE 027 614

AUTHOR Machung, Anne
TITLE College Guide Surveys and the Information Revolution: Issues and Consequences. AIR 1994 Annual Forum Paper.
PUB DATE May 94
NOTE 48p.; Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research (34th, New Orleans, LA, May 29-June 1 1994).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Access to Information; *College Choice; Directories; *Guides; *Higher Education; *Information Dissemination; Information Management; Information Seeking; Information Services; Information Sources; Information Utilization; Institutional Characteristics; Institutional Research; Selective Dissemination of Information; Surveys; User Needs (Information); Users (Information)
IDENTIFIERS *AIR Forum; *University of California Berkeley

ABSTRACT

In response to rapidly escalating survey response requests from publishers of college guides and magazine rating features, institutional researchers at the University of California at Berkeley (UC Berkeley) developed a standard response form. In fact, the extensive research and level of detail that many surveys request require significant effort on the part of the institution. That effort, it is argued, actually subsidizes the college guide publication industry as much of the information is sold commercially in database format and not used in guidebooks. The UC Berkeley prototype response consists of two documents: A "Fact Sheet" and a "Publication List." The Fact Sheet provides basic information on the campus such as enrollment, faculty size, admissions policies, library holdings, and includes only items, that are common to several surveys and published in guidebooks; and of actual value to parents and students looking for colleges. The Publications List outlines a set of standard campus publication and national data collection reports that provide more detailed information on various programs and issues. This basic set of information is provided to all guide publishers on request. (Includes a copy of the standard response form and a list of variables for the response form.) (Author/JB)

COLLEGE GUIDE SURVEYS AND THE INFORMATION REVOLUTION: ISSUES AND CONSEQUENCES

Anne Machung
Office of Institutional Research
University of California-Berkeley
Berkeley, CA 94720

Paper Prepared for Presentation at
Association for Institutional Research Forum
New Orleans
May 1994

for Management Research, Policy Analysis, and Planning

This paper was presented at the Thirty-Fourth Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research held at The New Orleans Marriott, New Orleans, Louisiana, May 29, 1994 - June 1, 1994. This paper was reviewed by the AIR Forum Publications Committee and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC Collection of Forum Papers.

Jean Endo
Editor
Forum Publications

College Guide Surveys and the Information Revolution:

Issues and Consequences

Abstract

Over the past few years, publishers of college guidebooks have flooded colleges with often quite lengthy and detailed surveys. Responding to this deluge of requests for information, two years ago the AAUDE established a sub-committee to examine the possibility of developing a standard instrument for its members to use when responding to college guide surveys. This paper discusses the political and methodological issues involved in generating a common instrument and presents the prototype developed for the University of California at Berkeley.

As information technology becomes cheaper and easier to use, the amount of information multiplies. While more information can help college administrators, faculty, and students make better decisions, it can also be overwhelming. The proliferation of new information technologies raises new questions and new concerns for institutional researchers: Who are our constituencies and what kind of obligation do we, as suppliers, have to provide them with information? Is there a point at which we should stop collecting information? And how can the information that is available be turned into something useful? The proliferation of college guide surveys provides one arena for examining these issues in depth.

In recent years colleges and universities have been flooded by surveys from publishers of college guides and from popular newsstand magazines like *U.S. News and World Report* and *Money Magazine* which rate them for "quality" or "best buy". Schools have responded to these surveys out of concern they would be misrepresented (or, worse yet, not represented at all) in various publications—and hence might lose some potentially

good publicity and potentially good students. Publishers, in turn, have fed into and helped produce this anxiety by claiming that there is "no charge for this service" and that it is in each school's "best interest" to respond. But is it really in each school's "best interest" to respond, and is the service publishers provide really so "free of charge"?

Facing this, college administrators across the country have become increasingly distressed at the amount of time and effort answering each survey individually requires. The questionnaires are often quite lengthy and ask extremely detailed questions. Frequently, they are redundant with each other, asking for similar types of information but in slightly different ways. While these differences (such as requests for the percentage of entering freshmen whose verbal and math SAT scores fall within one of six different hundredth intervals[1] vs. requests for the actual verbal and math SAT scores of entering freshmen at the 25th and 75th percentile[2]) may seem trivial, ferreting these differences out is extremely tedious and time-consuming. Moreover, even seemingly simple and innocuous questions, like the number of last year's graduating seniors who entered medical school or the percentage of students who live within commuting distance of campus, can prove impossible to answer.

In any event, answering these surveys requires extensive coordination across campus offices and sometimes new data collection and programming efforts.[3] Conservatively, I estimate that responding to these surveys costs the University of California at Berkeley at least one full FTE per year. Multiply the cost to one campus a thousand times over, as a thousand different campuses struggle to answer the same

---

1 Wintergreen/Orchard House, College/University Information Update, 1993-94, p.4.

2 The College Board Annual Survey of Colleges, 1994-95, p.15.

3 For example, College Counsel in their survey for *US News* regularly asks for the number of students enrolled in different sizes of graduate and undergraduate classes. Not a particularly difficult question to answer, except that College Counsel defines an undergraduate course as any course in which an undergraduate is enrolled and graduate course as any course in which a graduate student is enrolled—which is not how graduate or undergraduate level courses are ever defined at the University of California at Berkeley . Moreover, since graduate students at Berkeley can enroll in undergraduate level courses and vice versa, answering this particular question for College Counsel in the way they requested requires the Berkeley campus to redefine and recompute graduate and undergraduate level courses. This takes several hours of special programming effort—effort which does not benefit the campus at all.

surveys. At $50,000 per FTE, this amounts to a subsidy of $50 million per year from colleges and universities to the college guidebook publishing industry.

Moreover, while the manifest purpose of college guide surveys is to collect information for college guidebooks, much of the information collected is not published in college guidebooks at all. Rather it is used for other purposes, such as developing large data bases, some of which are sold commercially.[4] This is especially true for large publishing houses, like Peterson's, College Board, and Wintergreen/Orchard House, which request information which is esoteric even to college administrators. It is also true for publications like *U.S. News and World Report* and *Money Magazine,* which (according to their editors) use only a fraction of the information they collect to develop their ratings. Obviously, the marginal cost to a publisher of adding a question (or series of new questions) to a survey is relatively cheap compared to the cost to a campus of tracking down the information.

Lastly, the number, length, and amount of information requested is growing. Last year, for example, Peterson's sent seven different surveys to UC-Berkeley. Their survey of graduate programs alone was 140 pages long. That same year *U.S. News and World Report* added a whole new set of questions about financial aid to its standard survey of undergraduate institutions. In fact, the *US News* survey has grown from a single question—"What schools would you recommend for your own children?"—asked of college presidents in 1983, to a five-part document. In 1994 it required extensive coordination across institutional research, academic planning, housing, financial aid and accounting offices to answer that survey.

The widespread availability of information technology is propelling this quest for more information. Indeed, the market for college guidebooks is rapidly proliferating. There

---

[4] For example, Wintergreen/Orchard House recently sold a data bases to Hewlett Packard who used it to help them better define computer products for the college market. Peterson's, an editor there told me, regularly sells its data bases to insurance companies. These examples could be multiplied. A major part of the profit involved in collecting information from colleges and universities comes from selling that information back to governmental agencies, private corporations, and even colleges and schools themselves.

are college guidebooks for students with learning disabilities[5] and those with high SAT scores.[6] There are specialized texts for minority students, transfer students, foreign students, and Christian students.[7] There are guidebooks on the reference market for high school admissions counselors[8] and regional guidebooks in general bookstores for students who do not want to go out-of state.[9] And there are many, many financial aid guidebooks and software packages.[10] Clearly, the college guidebook market is a profitable one. Costs are relatively low in part because colleges and universities supply most of the information free of charge. But they are also low because new information technologies allow publishers to combine and recombine data from different surveys in all sorts of specialized ways and sell that information to different market segments in a multitude of different formats (books, magazines, CD-Roms, computerized software programs, etc.)

However, new information technology is not totally to blame. Colleges and universities fuel this process by treating surveys very seriously and responding to them on an immediate and on-going basis. Schools feel dependent upon college guidebooks for outreach and publicity. They fear that not responding to these surveys could hurt recruitment efforts. They also fear retaliation from publishers—letters or telephone calls to their presidents or chancellors complaining about surveys not answered; published information that is incorrect; zeros substituted for missing data and ratings subsequently lowered. But there is a backside to this as well, for indeed, the more information that

---

5 For example, see Peterson's *Programs for the Learning Disabled;* Kravet and Waxes *Guide to Colleges for the Learning Disabled;* or Wintergreen/Orchard House's, *College Guide for Students with Learning Disabilities.*

6 For example, see Simon and Schusters, *200 Most Selective Colleges* or Peterson's *Selective Colleges.*

7 For example, see the College Board's *Transfer Handbook* and *Foreign Student Handbook.* Or Peterson's *ACUUS, Applying to Colleges and Universities in the U.S.* Or Peterson's *Consider a Christian College.*

8 For example, see Wintergreen/Orchard Houses' 4-volume *College Admissions Handbook* or Chronicle's *Four Year College Databooks,* or their *Two-Year College Databook.*

9 For example, see Peterson's six-volume *Regional Guide Series* or Wintergreen/Orchard Houses' *College in California: The Inside Track, 1993-94.*

10 For example, see Arco's *College Financial Aid,* Peterson's *Paying Less for College,* the College Board's *College Costs Books,* or Chronicle Guidance Publication's 52-minute video guide, *How To Pay For College.*

schools provide, the more that publishers request. Indeed, some publishers have even come to feel that higher education institututions *owe* them information free of charge.

Responding to this deluge of requests for information, two years ago the AAUDE established a sub-committee to examine the feasibility of developing a standard instrument to use when responding to college guide surveys. How to respond to college guide surveys was also discussed at the AIR Forum in 1993. The Higher Education Data Policy Committee of AIR , the Public Relations Group of the Association of American Universities (AAURP), the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (ACRAO), and the National Association of College Admissions Counselors (NACAC) all are interested in developing some kind of common survey instrument.

The main idea behind a common instrument is that instead of responding to a particular set of questions sent by dozens of publishers of college guides, colleges and universities would send the same set of information to all inquirers. Doing so would significantly reduce the burden that individually answering each survey places upon a single institution. Preparing one comprehensive response is obviously much more efficient than responding to dozens of similar, but slightly different, questionnaires. The point is not to withhold information from publishers, but to provide them with what they need in a format that is convenient for colleges and universities.

The exact form this instrument will take is still under discussion. Two formats have been suggested: 1) an institutionally-specific model, or 2) a universally applicable single survey. Both have advantages and disadvantages, but using either one would enormously reduce the burden college guidebook surveys place on campuses.

The Berkeley Prototype: Drawing primarily from information actually published in college guidebooks, I developed an institutionally-specific prototype for the University of California-Berkeley. The prototype consists of two documents: a *Fact Sheet* and a *Publication List*. The *Fact Sheet* provides basic information on the campus (e.g., enrollment, faculty size, admissions policies, library holdings), and includes only items that

are: (1) common to several surveys and published in their guidebooks; and (2) of actual value to parents and students prospecting for colleges. The *Publications List* outlines a set of standard campus publications and national data collection reports, such as IPEDS, that provide more detailed information on various programs and issues. This basic set of information would be provided to all college guide publishers upon request.

In developing the prototype I analyzed surveys from Barron's, College Board, College Counsel, Chronicle College Databooks, Orchard House and Peterson's. I also reviewed each of the leading college guidebooks they published and compared what they asked in their surveys to what they published.[11] Publishers claim they need to use different surveys because they are publishing guidebooks for different segments of the market. However, I found while there is a significant amount of variety in the kinds of information publishers request,[12] there is remarkable similarity what they publish. Admittedly, there is some variety—some guidebooks include interviews with students, others pride themselves on a particular attribute, like Barron's Index of Selectivity—but in general the standard guidebooks are more alike than they are different.[13]

The strength of the Berkeley prototype, then, is that it outlines all the standard information a prospective student would want to know about a campus. Indeed, the Berkeley prototype was designed with this criterion in mind: that the information provided

---

11 Guidebooks I reviewed include: Barron's *Profiles of American Colleges, 19th ed;* College Board, *The College Handbook, 6th ed.*; Chronicle Guidance Publication's *Chronicle Four-Year College Databook;* Lovejoy's *College Guide;* U.S. News and World Report's 1994 edition of *America's Best Colleges;* David and Elizabeth Wilson's *Guide to 101 of the Best Values in American's Colleges and Universities, 1993 edition.*

12 The issues of how similar or how different college guidebook surveys are from one another is complicated. Jeff Dutton at SUNY-Buffalo has analyzed in detail questionnaires from Peterson's, College Board, Wintergreen/Orchard House, College Counsel and ACT. He found that while college guidebook publishers request an enormous amount of the same *type* of information—admissions policies, financial aid, faculty size, etc.—their questions vary enormously in specificity and detail. Indeed, only approximately 10-20% of the questions asked were actually identical with each other.

13 This should not be surprising. Just as Honda, Toyota and GEO Metro compete for different portions of the small car market, so Peterson's, College Board and Orchard House compete for different portions of the college guidebook market. Like the automobile market, the college guidebook market also is segmented—into general bookstores and reference markets and into general guidebooks, regional guidebooks and specialized guidebooks. Just as single publishers put out guidebooks for different segments of the college guidebook market, so within segments of that market they compete with each other for larger portions. How else to explain all the general bookstore guides on the market which seem remarkably similar to each other, or all the financial aid books?

to college guidebock publishers should be what is useful to prospective students and their parents. Secondly, the Berkeley prototype relies upon existing campus data and publications. It does not require institutional research or admissions offices to engage in additional data collection. Third, it is easy to design and easy to implement, requiring only campus-wide approval, not the endorsement of many institutions. Lastly, it eliminates the cost of providing information not published in college guidebooks. By adopting the Berkeley prototype and adapting it for their own use, colleges and universities could continue to be represented in major college guides without getting caught up in providing information, free of charge, for the proliferating market of specialized guidebooks, computer software products and profit-making corporations.

There are limitations to Berkeley's *Fact Sheet*, as there are for any piece of standard information. As I see it, the major limitation of this approach is that publishers would not receive all the information they requested in exactly the format they want. Some (especially those with short one or two-page questionnaires) would get more information than they requested, others would get less. Excluded would be such esoteric data as the minimum grade for which placement and/or credit is awarded for each AP examination in Latin, Vergil as opposed to Latin, Cattulus-Horace, or the type of management softeware used for admissions and records information—SCT Banner, AMS Legend, SCT/IA SIS Plus, or other commercial package.[14] Obviously, information like this is irrelevant to prospective freshmen, their parents, and even high school admissions counselors. Included, however, would be information on enrollments, accreditation, admissions policies, tuition and fees, academic programs, graduation rates, campus housing, social, cultural and athletic activities, and special programs for physically disabled or learning disabled students, health services on campus and career planning and placement services. (See attached *Fact Sheet* and *Variable List.)*

---

14 Both examples come from the College Board's *Annual Survey of Colleges, 1994-94*, pp.8-9, 23.

Most, if not all, surveying organizations now request an enormous amount of information, most of it in their own individualized, pre-coded, machine-readable formats. By providing exactly what is requested in the format it is requested in, colleges and universities have significantly reduced the cost of publishing college guidebooks. However, adopting a standard survey response like the Berkeley prototype would require publishers to sift through the information provided and code it themselves. In essence this would shift the burden of research costs from colleges and universities (who for years have been subsidizing the publishing industry) back onto publishers themselves. But this is my point: that campuses can no longer continue to subsidize these industries, especially as their requests for information escalate while our resource bases shrink.

Single Survey Instrument: An alternative approach to an institutionally-specific model like the Berkeley prototype is a single survey instrument using universally agreed upon definitions for all variables. Like the Berkeley prototype, a single survey would reduce the burden of answering multiple surveys, but unlike the Berkeley prototype it would present information in a standard format using common definitions. Such a survey would create a uniform data set of very high quality, which is one of its main attractions. It would also be much easier to extract information common to several schools from a single survey than from an institutionally-specific model.

But while intuitively appealing, a single survey approach immediately generates some very difficult questions. Which reporting statistics to use? Who should develop them, colleges and universities or publishers? And, given the diversity in higher education institutions, can enough common statistics be developed to satisfy both publishers and schools?

Indeed, the task of constructing non-ambiguous definitions that simultaneously fit a large number of different types of institutions, ranging from two-year vocational colleges to large, research-oriented, multi-campus multiversities, can be daunting. Take tuition as an example. Some schools, like MIT, charge everybody, graduate and undergraduate alike, a

flat rate per year. Other schools, like UC-Berkeley, do not charge tuition at all, but many of their fees, like the University Registration Fee, Educational Fee, and Berkeley Campus Fee, sound suspiciously like tuition. Other schools, like the University of Michigan-Ann Arbor, have extraordinarily complicated fee structures which vary by level of student, date of admittance, major, etc. And still other schools simply charge on a per credit basis—so much for so many credits. Obviously, even a seemingly simple question, like "How much tuition do you charge?", produces an array of complicated answers. Multiply the number of definitions needed to answer a single question by the number of questions asked in a standard survey and one has produced an overwhelmingly complicated and confusing document.

Publishers' solution to the enormous complexity and diversity among higher education institutions has been to keep it simple: let most definitions remain ambiguous and let each institution determine how it wants to define itself. While this may offend those who have been trained in the canons of objectively neutral scientific research, it is important to recognize that such ambiguity serves not just publishers' needs but institutional interests as well.

The same data, for example, is often used for different ends, and these ends can be at cross-purposes with one another. For example, the institutional researcher's goal of producing high quality data for comparative purposes can conflict with public relations officers' desire to present the institution in the best possible light. The former generates a desire for clear, consistent, non-ambiguous definitions; the latter for loose, flexible and ambiguous definitions. The conflict between data used for different ends shows up in many different ways. If one wants to plan the curriculum in a department for the coming year, for example, one needs to know exactly how many faculty will be available for teaching. However, if one wishes to construct a student-faculty ratio that will attract students, perhaps it is better to count faculty on sabbatical leave, faculty with research appointments, part-time faculty, and possibly even emeriti faculty since these presumably will be available to students at some point in their academic career.

Clear definitions, that is, are most possible, and most likely to be used, when the information requested is straightforward, relatively easy to collect, and not politically sensitive. Enrollment figures are a case in point, hence the easy availability of IPEDS definitions. However, when data becomes more difficult to collect and more politically sensitive, establishing consensually agreed upon definitions, as the current debates over student right-to-know demonstrate, is far more complicated. Indeed, these are the shoals upon which a common survey instrument has floundered to date.

Issues to Consider in Designing and Adopting a Standard Survey Instrument

1. How much of the information being published is actually reaching those it is designed to reach—potential undergraduates, their parents, and high school and college admissions officers? This is difficult to answer. Publishers cite circulation figures, but in themselves circulation figures say little about how college guidebooks and software programs are actually used. Most of the information is anecdotal and impressionistic. Visiting local high schools in her area, one college admissions counselor from Texas A&M found only a few schools had bought any of the standardized guidebooks or computerized software packages now on the market. Budgets were limited, and in some cases schools did not have computers large enough to handle the data sets. Those who had purchased computerized software programs would not allow students to use them.

2. So how helpful are college guidebooks to entering freshmen? The answer to this is murky as well. However, it seems that college guidebooks are one, and only one, source of information students use when prospecting for colleges. A study of freshmen who matriculated at Tulane University, for example, found that students used sources like *Barrons* and *Money Magazine* to pare down the list of schools they were considering. However, they based their final decision on what school to attend on other factors. A 1993 survey at Rutgers found that 35-45% of entering freshmen considered college guidebooks either "important" or "very important" in helping them select Rutgers. Not clear, however, was how these freshmen used the guidebooks, what other sources of information they

used, and how the other 55-65% of entering freshmen who did not use guidebooks made their decisions.

3. What impact might adopting a standard survey response have on a school's outreach and recruitment efforts? This is an area of great concern and anxiety, especially for public relations personnel, but whether their concerns are justified or not is simply unknown. Admittedly, many schools have benefited from the publicity college guidebooks provide but how much they have benefited is by no means clear. Most probably, this varies by type of institution, size and academic reputation. Larger, more prestigious, better known schools, like Berkeley, Harvard or Yale, depend less upon college guidebooks for attracting students than smaller, less well-known institutions.[15] But smaller schools, like Mills or Occidental College in California, often do not have sufficient resources for answering college guidebook surveys. Their institutional research offices (when they exist) often consist of only one person, who simply does not have the time to answer each and every college guidebook survey. Ironically, schools that most need the publicity offered by college guidebooks may have the fewest resources for providing publishers the information they request.

4. How will publishers respond to a package of standard information? This is a big concern on campuses, especially among those looking for balance between satisfying publishers' requests for information and institutional needs for downsizing and reducing workload. Increasingly a number of publishers seem to recognize the burden that answering surveys places upon university administrations, and some, like Wintergreen/ Orchard House,[16] are receptive to the idea of a common survey instrument. Peterson's

---

15 Berkeley, for example, depends mostly upon its academic reputation for attracting students. Each year about 20,000 graduating high school seniors compete for about 3,400 spaces in the entering freshman class. Virtually all these students are graduating in the top 10% of their high school class and a large percentage have 4.0 GPA's. Berkeley's problem thus is not one of attracting a sufficent number of qualified undergraduates, but rather of justifying admissions turn-downs to those who are also highly qualified. In solving this problem, college guidebooks are of little help.

16 Several smaller schools have asked Wintergreen/Orchard House for permission to answer other survey requests with the Orchard House survey, in effect, using the Orchard House survey as a standard survey response document. However, there are a number of problems connected with adopting the Orchard House instrument on a wider basis. For one, most colleges and universities do not want to be put into the position of favoring one publisher over another. Secondly, the Orchard House instrument also includes

and *US News* now incorporate IPEDS definitions into their standard survey instruments.[17] These efforts are commendable. Indeed, publishers' advice and feedback will be invaluable as schools develop a more comprehensive survey instrument. To reach a mutually agreeable format, university administrations and college guidebook publishers need to cooperate with each other.

5. How should schools handle the many specialized requests for information they receive? Typically, specialized surveys ask highly detailed questions—on graduate programs, financial aid, or programs for minority, disabled, transfer or foreign students—most of which cannot be answered by a standard survey response. On an individual basis schools might choose to answer some specialized surveys, such as surveys about specific graduate programs, while still using a *Standard Survey Response* for answering general questions about undergraduate programs.

6. How should schools handle ranking surveys sent out by major news organizations, like *U.S. News and World Report* and *Money Magazine?* This is a sensitive issue, given the publicity that accompanies nationally advertised ratings. Thus higher education institutions may want to continue answering rating surveys on an individual basis. However, a policy of answering college guidebooks surveys with a standard survey instrument while answering rating surveys on an individual basis could give rating magazines license to request virtually anything they wanted from colleges and universities and expect to receive it. In turn, this would allow major news magazines to develop huge data bases replete with information about higher education while denying a similar commercial opportunity to college guidebook publishers. One solution is to limit the amount of information provided to magazines like *U.S. News andWorld Report* and *Money Magazine* to only those variables they actually use when developing their ratings.

---

items, such as the total number of microcomputers on campus or the percentage of graduates who enter the job market in a field related to their major within two years of graduation, that merit closer scrutiny.

17 While using standard definitions, like IPEDS enrollment data does help to simplify the reporting requirement, IPEDS alone is totally insufficent, for 80-90% of the information requested by most surveys is not covered by IPEDS, or indeed by any other standard definitions.

7. What about the future? As I have argued throughout this paper, the number, length and amount of information requested from surveys will probably continue to grow as information technology becomes cheaper and easier to use. Wintergreen/Orchard House, Peterson's and College Board already produce slightly different versions of the same book for what they claim are different segments of the market (but in reality are probably different portions of the same market segment). To ask a radical question, how necessary is all this information? One of the basic assumptions of the Information Age in which we now live is that information is good, and more is better. But is this true?

Obviously, students, parents and high school admissions counselors need information in order to make good decisions about which colleges to attend. But what kinds of information do they need? How can that best be provided? Does more information necessarily help them to make better decisions? And at what point do they reach information overload? Rather than mindlessly adding questions to questionnaires to see what comes back, or mindlessly filling in the blanks because blanks need to be filled in, we should begin to ask what are real information needs.

This applies not just to college guidebooks but to virtually every facet of our lives. Just as there is danger in too little information, there is danger in too much—the danger that on the leveling ground of massive computerized data bases, we may lose our intuition, our sense of priorities, and our good judgment. Just as too little information can lead to poor decisions, oo much information can lead to indecision and confusion or to attempts to oversimplify in order to gain control over so much information. The real question is: How much is enough?

Standard Survey Response

University of California-Berkeley

Office of Institutional Research
University of California-Berkeley
Updated March 9, 1994

Table of Contents

Standard Survey Response

University of California-Berkeley

1. General Information about the Berkeley campus:

Founded in 1868, the University of California-Berkeley is a four-year, public, non-sectarian, co-educational university. Chang-Lin Tien is Chancellor of the University and chief administrative officer. The campus is located in an urban environment, 10 miles east of San Francisco and is approximately 1200 acres. Berkeley operates on a semester basis and has an extensive summer program. The general information number for the campus is: (510) 642-6000.

2. Accreditation:

The University of California-Berkeley is formally accredited by: Western Association of School and Colleges

The following associations accredit various professional schools and colleges:

Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology
American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business
American Bar Association
American Chemical Society
American Council on Education in Journalism & Mass Communications
American Dietetic Association
American Library Association
American Psychological Association
American Society of Landscape Architecture
California State Board of Optometry
Council on Social Work Education
National Architecture Accrediting Board
Society of American Foresters

3. Administrative Structure:

Berkeley has nine schools and five colleges, most of which are sub-divided into departments or divisions. Colleges accept students directly from high school or as transfers and offer undergraduate instruction leading to a bachelor's degree. The College of Letters and Science has the largest undergraduate enrollment, followed by the College of Engineering. Schools usually begin instruction at the upper division level or graduate level and provide students with preparatory training for specific professions.

Enrollment in Schools and Colleges, Fall 1993

	Undergraduate	Graduate	Total
College of Chemistry	700	429	1129
College of Engineering	2,378	1,484	3862
College of Environmental Design	588	399	987
College of Letters and Sciences	16,702	2,870	19,572
College of Natural Resources	733	285	1,018
Walter A. Haas School of Business	475	755	1,230
Graduate School of Education	0	380	380
Graduate School of Journalism	0	90	90
School of Law	0	801	801
School of Library and Information Studies	0	87	87
School of Optometry	136	157	293
School of Public Health	0	522	522
Graduate School of Public Policy	0	82	82
School of Social Welfare	0	243	243

4. Financial Standing:

See *Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Finance Survey, Fiscal Year 1993*

5. Faculty (as of Dec. 18, 1993):

Number of full-time ladder-rank faculty: 1443*
Percentage of faculty with Ph.D. or other terminal degree: 95%
Percentage of faculty who are male: 81%; female: 19%
Percentage of faculty who are ethnic minority: 12.5%
Percentage of faculty with tenure: 86%

* This includes about 20 non-ladder rank faculty with security of employment.

Faculty Honors:

Number of Nobel Laureates: 8
National Academy of Science Members: 108
National Academy of Engineering Members: 56
American Academy of Arts and Sciences Members: 173

Alfred P. Sloan Faculty Fellowships 1984-92: 42
National Medal of Science, 1982-1992: 11

6. Student-Faculty Ratio: 17.6:1

7. Admissions Policies:

Admissions Selectivity: Highly Selective

Basis for Admissions: (1) high school grades and test scores; (2) rural or nontraditional high school enrollment, special talents, socio-economic background, disabilities, re-entry status, athletic recruitment, ethnicity.

Application Fee: $40; may be waived for in-state residents with financial need.

Closing Date for Applications: Nov. 30
Notification Date: March 15
Reply required by: May 1

No open admissions
No rolling admissions
No early decision plan
No early admissions plan
No deferred admissions
Some fall applicants are offered spring term admissions.

8. Admissions: Entering Freshmen:

A. Admissions Requirements:

History/Social Sciences -- two years
English - four years
Mathematics -- three years required; four recommended
Laboratory Science -- two years required; three recommended
Foreign Language -- two years required; three recommended
College Preparatory Electives -- two years, chosen from the following areas: history, English, advanced mathematics, laboratory science, foreign language, social science and visual or performing arts

Minimum high school GPA: 3.3 for California residents; 3.4 for out-of-state students.

Tests Required: Either SAT or ACT, and three College Board Achievement Tests; tests should be taken by the end of December.

Written Essay Required

B. Applicants, Admits, Registrants, Fall 1993:

	Men	Women	Total
Number applied:	10,302	9571	19,873
Number admitted:	4291	3961	8,252
Number enrolled:	1687	1528	3215

C. SAT Scores, Fall 1993:

	SAT-V	SAT-M
25th percentile	500	590
75th percentile	640	730
Mean	564	654
Median	570	680

C. High School GPA's, Fall 1993:

Median high school GPA:	4.0
Mean high school GPA:	3.83
Percent in top 10% of high school class:	95%

D. Demographic Characteristics, Fall 1993:

Source high school: 73% from California public high schools; 13% from California private schools; 14% other.

Residency: 86% in-state; 9% out-of state; 1% foreign; 4% no data.

Ethnicity: 1% American Indian; 40% Asian; 6% African-American; 11.6% Chicano; 5.5% Latino; 30% Caucasian; 6% other/no data.

Average age: 18 years

Family Income:

25% Percentile	$28,000
50% Percentile (median)	$55,000
75th Perentile	$90,000

9. Admissions: Transfer Students

A. Admissions Policies and Requirements:

Transfer students are accepted for fall and spring terms. Application deadline is Nov. 30 for fall; July 31 for spring. Minimum 2.4 GPA is required of in-state applicants and 2.8 GPA for out-of-state applicants. Lowest course grade accepted is "D". Students applying to transfer into Berkeley are required to have completed at least 60 transferable units and no more than 80-90 units (depending upon the specific college). Additionally, transfer applicants must complete all lower-division courses for their intended major and college prior to admission. Sophomore transfers are not accepted.

B. Applicants, Admits, Registrants, Fall 1993:

Number of completed transfer applications received:	6301
Number of transfer applicants offered admission:	2081
Number of transfer students who enrolled:	1474

C. Admissions Statistics, Fall 1993:

Percent undergraduates who were new transfers: 7%

Source school of transfer students: 82% from California community colleges; 6% from other U.C. campuses; 2% from California State Universities; 1% from private colleges; 2% from non-California community colleges; 5% out-of-state; 3% no data.

10. Admissions: Foreign Students:

A. Admissions Policies and Requirements:

Berkeley does not actively recruit foreign students. Foreign students who apply are required to pass the TOEFL exam with a score of 550 or more. Freshman applicants are required to take the SAT test and three CEEB tests by December.

B. Admissions Statistics, Fall 1993:

Total number of undergraduate foreign students:	798
Total number of graduate foreign students:	1203

11. Director of Admissions:

Bob Laird
Interim Director, Undergraduate Admissions
University of California-Berkeley
110 Sproul Hall
Berkeley, CA 94720-5800

Telephone: (510) 642-3175
Fax: (510) 642-7333

12. Projected Costs, 1993-94:

A. Tuition and Fees:

	Undergraduate		Graduate	
	Resident	Non-Resident	Resident	Non-Resident
Educational Fee	$2761	$2761	$2761	$2761
Registration Fee	693	693	693	693
Berkeley Campus Fees	157.50	157.50	157.50	157.50
Non-Resident Fee		7699		7699
Health Insurance Fee	358	358	$94	394
Total Registration Fees	$3969.50	$11,688.50	$4005.50	$11,704.50

B. Other Expenses (Standard Undergraduate Budget):

Room and Board	$6025
Books and Supplies	600
Personal Expenses	1582
Transportation	300
Total Living Expenses	$8507

13. Financial Aid:

A. Financial Aid Policies:

1. Berkeley admits students without regard to financial aid.

2. Up through 1993, Berkeley has been able to meet the financial need of any in-state student admitted.

3. The amount of financial aid awarded depends upon student's financial need.

4. The maximum amount for non-need based academic scholarships (of which there are very few) is $500.

B. Types of Financial Aid Available:

General types of aid: grants, scholarships, loans, work-study.

Types of grants: federal (Pell Grant, Supplemental Education Opportunity Grant -- SEOG); state (Cal Grants A & B); and university (University Grant-In-Aid).

Types of loans: Perkins Loan, Stafford Loans Health Professions Student Loan, Supplemental Loan for Students, Parent Loan to Assist Undergraduate Students.

Types of merit and need-based academic scholarships: University Scholarships; President's Undergraduate Fellowships; Regents and Chancellor's Scholars; Alumni Scholarships.

Types of work-study: federal; state.

C. Application Process:

Financial statements required: *Free Application for Federal Student Aid;* federal tax forms may also be required for some students.

Deadline for consideration of all types of financial aid: March 2 (Students may apply for Pell grants and federal loans after the March 2 deadline).

D. Financial Aid Statistics:

Percent of all undergraduates receiving financial aid:	51%
Percent of all freshmen who received aid:	55%
Percent of all continuing students who received aid:	49%
Percent of all financial aid at Berkeley which is need-based:	97%
Percent of freshmen receiving need-based financial aid:	53%
Percent of continuing students receiving need-based financial aid:	48%
Average amount of financial aid awarded all students:	$5400
Average amount of financial aid awarded freshmen:	$5700

E. College Work-Study Program:

Percent of undergraduates who participate in College Work Study Program: 8%
Percent of all undergraduates who work part-time on campus: 34%
Average earnings from campus work per year: $2,000

14. Enrollment Statistics:

A. Campus Totals, Fall 1993:

	Undergraduate	Graduate	Total
Male	11,512	4,974	16,486
Female	10,201	3,654	13,855
Total	21,713	8,628	30,341

B. Undergraduate Totals (Fall 1993):

By gender: 53% men; 47 % women.

By ethnicity: 35% white/Caucasian; 6% Black/African-American; 14% Hispanic; 36% Asian; 1% American Indian; 1% other; 7% no data.

By residency: 90% in-state; 6% out-of-state; 4% foreign.

Average age: 20.9

C. Graduate Totals: (Fall 1993):

By gender: 58% male; 42% female

By ethnicity: 69% white/Caucasian; 4% Black/African-American; 7% Hispanic; 15% Asian; 1% American Indian; 1% other; 3% no data.

Percent foreign: 14%

15. Degree Requirements for Undergraduates:

Undergraduates must satisfy three general university and campus requirements: English and writing proficiency (Subject A); American History and Institutions; and American Cultures. Students must also maintain a minimum GPA of 2.0 and meet specific requirements for each college and major. For graduation, 120 hours are required; 24 of the last 30 hours must be completed in residence at Berkeley.

16. Undergraduate Majors:

Berkeley offers over 100 undergraduate degrees in the following fields:

African American Studies, A.B.
American Studies, A.B.
Ancient Near Eastern Archaeology and Art History, A.B.
Anthropology, A.B.
Architecture, A.B.
Art (History of), A.B.
Art (Practice of), A.B.
Asian Studies, A.B.
Asian American Studies, A.B.
Astrophysics, A.B.
Bioengineering, B.S.
Bioresource Sciences, B.S.
Business Administration, B.S.
Celtic Studies, A.B.
Chemical Engineering, B.S.
Chemistry, A.B. or B.S.
Chicano Studies, A.B.
Civil Engineering, B.S.
Classical Civilization, A.B.

Classical Languages, A.B.
Cognitive Science, A.B.
Comparative Literature, A.B.
Computer Science, A.B. or B.S
Conservation and Resource S[illegible]s, B.S.
Development Studies, A.B.
Dramatic Art, A.B.
Dramatic Art--A.B.
Dutch Studies, A.B.
Earth Science, A.B.
East Asian Languages, A.B. (Chinese, Japanese, Altaic)
Economics, A.B.
Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences, B.S.
Engineering, Seven Double Major Programs, B.S.
Engineering Geoscience, B.S.
Engineering Mathematics and Statistics, B.S.
Engineering Physics, B.S.
English, A.B.
Entomology, B.S.
Environmental Sciences, A.B.
Ethnic Studies, A.B.
Film, A.B.
Forest Products, B.S.
Forestry, B.S.
French, A.B.
Geography, A.B.
Geology, A.B.
Geophysics, A.B.
German, A.B.
Greek, A.B.
History, A.B.
Humanities, A.B.
Industrial Engineering and Operations Research, B.S.
Integrative Biology, A.B.
Interdisciplinary Studies, A.B.
Italian, A.B.
Landscape Architecture, A.B.
Latin, A.B.
Latin American Studies, A.B.
Legal Studies, A.B.
Linguistics, A.B.
Manufacturing Engineering, B.S.
Mass Communications, A.B.
Material Science and Engineering, B.S.
Mathematics, A.B.
Mathematics, Applied, A.B.
Mechanical Engineering, B.S.
Middle Eastern Studies, A.B.
Mineral Engineering, B.S.
Molecular and Cell Biology, A.B.
Music, A.B.
Native American Studies, A.B.
Naval Architecture, B.S.
Near Eastern Studies, A.B.
Nuclear Engineering, B.S.
Nutrition and Clinical Dietetics, B.S.
Nutrition and Food Science, B.S.

Optometry, O.D.
Peace and Conflict Studies, A.B.
Petroleum Engineering, B.S.
Philosophy, A.B.
Physical Education, A.B.
Physical Sciences, A.B.
Physics, A.B.
Plant Biology, B.S.
Political Economy of Industrial Societies, A.B.
Political Economy of Natural Resources, B.S.
Political Science, A.B.
Psychology, A.B.
Religious Studies, A.B.
Rhetoric, A.B.
Scandinavian, A.B. (Danish, Norwegian, Swedish)
Slavic Languages and Literatures, A.B.
Social Sciences, A.B.
Social Welfare, A.B.
Sociology, A.B.
Soil Environment, B.S.
South and Southeast Asian Studies, A.B.
Spanish, A.B.
Statistics, A.B.
Vision Science, B.S.
Women's Studies, A.B.

Five most popular majors for 1991-92: English (478); Political Science (356); Economics (354); Molecular and Cell Biology (344); Business Administration (293).

17. Degrees Awarded:

Types of degrees: A.B., B.S., M.A., M.S., MBA, Ph.D., Ed.D., OD, JD.

Number of degrees awarded 1992-93:

Bachelors:	5829
Masters	1670
Ph.D.s:	810
First Professional:	374
Certificates:	59
Candidate:	114
Total	8856

18. Graduation Rates and Retention Statistics:*

Percent of entering freshmen returning for their sophomore year:	91%
Percent of entering freshmen graduating four years later:	36%
Percent of entering freshmen graduating five years later:	72%
Percent of entering freshmen graduating six years later:	78%

*Based on cohort of entering freshmen, Fall 1986.

19. Post-Graduation Activities of Graduating Seniors:

A year following graduation, a survey of 1989-90 graduates indicated:

Percent working full-time:	60%
Percent in school full-time:	23%
Percent working part-time:	11%
Percent neither working nor in school:	6%

Plans for future education:

Percent currently pursuing a degree, credential, or license:	34%
Percent planning to pursue a degree, credential, or licence within the next few years:	65%
Percent believing they will pursue one or more degrees sometime in their lives	93%

20. Housing:

A. Campus Housing Policies:

1. Students may live on or off-campus.
2. The university does not guarantee housing to undergraduates for all four years.
3. Assignment to university-operated housing is established by a random lottery. There is no "first come/first served" policy.
4. Housing in residence halls is guaranteed to all new, incoming fall freshmen who apply by the deadlines.
5. Some seats in campus dormitories are set aside for junior transfers.

B. University-Operated Housing :

Type of Housing	Spaces Available
Male, female, co-ed dormitories, and five "theme houses" which provide a living environment focused on a language or culture	5,200
University Family Student Housing	1,020

Percent of freshmen who live in campus housing:	85%
Percent of all undergraduates who live in campus housing:	25%

C. Sororities and Fraternities:

Number of sororities (College Panhellenic Association):	15
Number of undergraduate women who live in sororities:	1100
Number of fraternities:	41
Number of undergraduate men who live in fraternities:	1100

D. Other Housing:

Type of Housing	Spaces Available
Student cooperatives	1,200
International House (primarily for graduate students from foreign countries)	600

21. Library Holdings:

Berkeley's library system contains one of the best research collections in the country. The system consists of the Main (Doe) Library, the Moffitt Undergraduate Library, the Bancroft Library, 22 branch libraries, and many special libraries.

Number of book titles:	7,854,600
Number of current serial publications:	88,300
Number of manuscripts:	55,000,000
Number of microform items:	4,580,800
Number of maps:	398,500
Number of sound recordings:	60,000

22. Computer Facilities:

The Berkeley campus provides access to a full range of computing capabilities from individual workstations to supercomputers. Apple Macintosh, DEC VAX station running ULTRIX and VMS, IBM PC, PS/2, and compatible, IBM RS/6000, NeXT, and Sun UNIX workstations are supported by Workstations Support Services. DEC RISC computers running UNIX, an IBM 3090 computer running VM/CMS, a Cray supercomputer and Sun clusters are supported by Central Computing Services. Many of the computers on campus are connected to each other via the campus network, which in turn is connected to major national and international data communication networks, such as Internet and BITNET.

Specialized instructional computing facilities are available at the Tolman Microcomputer Facilities, Workstations in Evans Basement, the Humanities Microcomputer Facilities, the Davis Microcomputers and Workstation Facilities, and the Quantitative Anthropology Laboratory. Terminals for general student use are also located in campus libraries and many other buildings around campus.

Among academic units, Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences, Business Administration, Chemistry, Physics, Library and Information Studies, Engineering, and many others have extensive computing facilities.

23. Special Facilities on Campus:

Botanical Garden
Lawrence Hall of Science
Hearst Museum of Anthropology
Museum of Paleontology
Museum of Vertebrate Zoology
Pacific Film Archive
University Art Museum
Zellerbach Hall for the Performing Arts

24. Honorary Academic Groups:

Berkeley has seven national honor societies: Honor Students Society, Phi Beta Kappa, Prytanean, Mortar Board, Golden Key, Omega, and Tau Beta Pi. Specific disciplines also have their own honor societies.

25. Special Academic Programs:

Advanced Placement Credit

Cross-registration with: California State University-Hayward; College of Holy Names; Dominican College; JFK University; Mills College; San Francisco State University; Sonoma State University; St. Mary's College

Double major

Dual degrees

Dual enrollment of high school students

Independent (student-designed) majors

Freshmen Seminar Program

Independent Study

Internships:

Cal-in-the-Capital: summer internship in Washington, D.C.
Cal-in-Sacramento: summer internship in state government
Cal-in-the-City: semester internship in city government
Cooperative Education Internship Program
Directory of Campus Resources for Student Internships at Career Planning and Placement Library lists many other internship programs.

Pass-Fail grading option

Placement tests in English and Math for Freshmen

The Title IX Officer addresses concerns, questions and complaints regarding sexual harassment. She also provides information and referrals about sexual harassment and investigates complaints. The Women's Resource Center provides crisis intervention counseling and information about campus policy and complaint procedures for students. The Rape Prevention Education Program offers crisis counseling and referrals for victims of sexual harassment, sexual assault or rape.

C. Student Grievance Procedure: Gives students an opportunity to resolve complaints alleging discrimination based on race, color, national origin, sex, handicap, age, and sexual orientation. Inquiries about this procedure or its interrelationship with other campus complaint procedures may be directed to the Assistant Chancellor, Affirmative Action and Special Projects.

D. The Office of Student Conduct: Investigates and resolves cases of student organizational misconduct and individual student misconduct, including allegations of plagiarism, cheating, forgery, racial and sexual harassment, physical abuse and the recently adopted University policy prohibiting the use of "fighting words" by students to harass others on University property or anywhere in connection with University functions or programs. Rules governing student conduct, student organizations, use of University facilities and related matters are set forth in both University policies and campus regulations, copies of which are available at the Office of Student Activities and Services.

Selected Publications

I. General Information:

Introducing Berkeley, 1993-94, Office of Admissions

General Catalog 1993-94, ASUC Bookstore

Resource: A reference guide for new Berkeley students,1993/94 edition, Office of Student Activities and Services

II. Specific Information:

Integrated Post-Secondary Education Data System (IPEDS):
Finance Survey, Fiscal Year 1993

Office of Admissions:
Application for Undergraduate Admission & Scholarships,1994-95
Answers for Transfers, 1994-95
International Student Undergraduate Application, 1994-95
Information for International Applicants

Office of Financial Aid:
Financial Aid Facts: University of California at Berkeley

Office of Institutional Research:
Campus Statistics, Fall 1993

Office of Student Research:
After the Bachelor's Degree: Career Survey Results of 1989-90 Graduates
Undergraduate Admissions Statistics: Fall 1993

Sponsored Projects Office:
Research at Berkeley, 1992-93

Student Housing Office:
Housing at Cal 1994-95

University of California Police:
CAL B-SAFE

III. Selected Programs:

Freshman Seminar Program, Brochure

Disabled Students Program, Brochure

Student Learning Center, Brochure

List of Variables

for

Standard Survey Response

University of California-Berkeley

Office of Institutional Research
University of California-Berkeley
Updated March 9, 1994

LIST OF VARIABLES

STANDARD SURVEY RESPONSE— UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA-BERKELEY

Index

VARIABLE LIST

STANDARD SURVEY RESPONSE— UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA-BERKELEY

1. General Information:

   Name of Institution:
   Address:
   General Information Number:

   Name and Title of Chief Administrative Officer:

   Type of Institution:
   - Two-year, four-year:
   - Control (Public, private:)
   - Religious affiliation:
   - Co-educational or not:

   Date Founded:

   Location:
   - Urban, rural, suburban:
   - Name of closest large city:
   - Number of miles from closest large city:
   - Size of campus (in acres, square miles, etc.):

   Calendar Basis:
   - Semester/quarter:
   - Any summer program:

2. Accreditation:

   Chief accrediting organization:

   Organizations accrediting individual programs within the Instititution (e.g. American Bar Association):

3. Academic Structure:

   Describe the academic structure of the institution, with particular relevance for those units admitting undergraduates:

   List undergraduate, graduate and total enrollment for each of Berkeley's 14 colleges and schools:

4. Financial Standing:

See *Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Finance Survey*

5. Faculty:

Number of full-time ladder-rank faculty:
Percentage of faculty with Ph.D. or other terminal degree:
Percentage of faculty who are male:
Percentage of faculty who are female:
Percentage of faculty who are ethnic minority:
Percentage of faculty with tenure:

Faculty Honors:

Number of Nobel Laureates:
Number of National Academy of Sciences members:
Number of National Academy of Engineering members:
Number of Academy of Arts and Sciences members:
Number of Alfred P. Sloan Faculty Fellowships:
Number of National Medal of Sciences awards:

6. Student-Faculty Ratio:

7. Admissions Policies:

Admissions Selectivity:

Basis for Admission (e.g., high school grades, test scores, special talents, ethnicity, school or community activities, interview, disabilities, athletics, alumni relation, religious affiliation, other):

Application Fee:
Amount of Fee:
Can fee be waived for students with financial need?

Filing Dates:
For Admission:
Notification Date:
Reply required by:

Admissions Policies:
Open admissions:
Rolling admissions:
Early decision plan:
Early admissions plan:
Deferred admissions:

8. Admissions--Entering Freshmen:

A. Admissions Requirements:

Number of Required High School Units:
History:
Social Sciences:
English:
Mathematics:
Laboratory Science:
Foreign Language:
Visual or performing arts:
Other:

Minimum high school GPA
For in-state residents:
For out-of-state residents:

Tests Required:
SAT:
ACT:
College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB) Achievement Tests:

Written essay required:

Deadline for taking tests:

B. Applicants, Admits, Registrants::

Number of applicants, by gender:
Number admitted, by gender:
Number enrolled, by gender:

C. SAT Scores for Entering Freshmen:

	SAT-V	SAT-M
25th percentile	___	___
50th percential (median)	___	___
75th percentile	___	___
Mean	___	___

D. High School GPA and Class Standing for Entering Freshmen:

Median high school GPA:
Mean high school GPA:
Percent of entering freshmen in top 10% of high school class:
Percent of entering freshmen in top 25% of high school class:

E. Demographic Characteristics of Entering Freshmen:

Source high school:
Percent from public high schools:
Percent from private or parochial schools:

Residency:
Percent in-state residents:
Percent out-of state residents:
Percent foreign:
Percent other/no data:

Gender:
Percent male:
Percent female:

Ethnicity:
Percent American Indian:
Percent Asian:
Percent African-American:
Percent Chicano
Percent Latino:
Percent Caucasian:
Percent Other:
Percent no data:

Average age of entering freshmen:

Family income:
25th percentile:
50th percentile (median):
75th percentile:

9. Admissions—Transfer Students:

A. Admissions Policies and Requirements:

Admissions requirements:
Minimum GPA:
Minimum number of units allowed to transfer:
Maximum number of units allowed to transfer:
Lowest course grade accepted:
Other requirements:

Admissions Policies:
Term(s) transfer students are accepted for:
Application deadline for each term:
Sophomore transfers accepted:
Other policies:

B. Applicants, Admits, Registrants:

Number of transfer applications received:
Number of transfer applicants admitted:
Number of transfer students who enrolled:

C. Admissions Statistics: New Transfers:

Percent of all undergraduates were new transfers:

Source school of transfer students:
% from community colleges:
% from four-year colleges:
% other

10. Admissions—Foreign Students:

A. Admissions Policies and Requirements:

Tests required:
TOEFL required:
Minimum TOEFL score:
SAT or ACT required:
Minimum SAT or ACT score:

Other policies:

B. Admissions Statistics:

Total number of undergraduate foreign students:
Total number of graduate foreign students:

11. Director of Admissions:

Name:
Address:
Telephone:
FAX:

12. Projected Costs:

	Resident Undergraduate	Non-resident Undergraduate
Tuition		
Fees		
Housing		
Books and Supplies		
Personal Expenses		
Transportation		
Total Student Budget		

13. Financial Aid:

A. Financial Aid Policies:

1. Does the institution admit students without regard to financial aid?
2. Is the institution able to meet the financial need of any student admitted?
3. Upon what basis are financial awards made (e.g. financial need, merit, etc.):

B. Types of Financial Aid Available:

Grants:

Loans:

Merit-based scholarships:

Need-based academic scholarships:

Work-study: federal; state.

C. Application Process:

Financial statements required:

Deadline for applying for financial aid:

D. Financial Aid Statistics:

Percent of all undergraduates receiving financial aid:
Percent of all freshmen receiving financial aid:
Percent of all continuing students receiving financial aid:

Percent of all financial aid which is need-based:
Percent of all freshmen receiving need-based awards:
Percent of all continuing students receiving need-based awards:

Average amount of financial aid awarded all students:
Average amount of financial aid awarded freshmen:

E. College Work-Study Program:

Percent of undergraduates who participate in College Work Study Program:

Percent of all undergraduates who work part-time on campus:

Average annual earning for on-campus employment:

14. Enrollment Statistics:

A. Campus Totals:

Number of undergraduates, by gender:
Number of graduate students, by gender:
Total number, by gender:

B. Undergraduate Totals:

Undergraduate enrollment by ethnicity:
Percent White/Caucasian:
Percent Black/African-American:
Percent Hispanic:
Percent Asian:
Percent American Indian:
Percent Indian/Pakistani:
Percent Other:

Percent No data:

Undergraduate enrollment by residency:
% in-state residents:
% out-of-state:

Average age of undergraduates:

C. Graduate Totals:

Graduate enrollment by ethnicity:
Percent white/Caucasian:
Percent Black/African-American:
Percent Hispanic:
Percent Asian:
Percent American Indian:
Percent Indian/Pakistani:
Percent other:
Percent no data:

[For detailed enrollment statistics, see IPEDS Enrollment Survey.]

15. Degree Requirements for Undergraduates:

Number of credits required:

Residency requirements:

GPA requirements:

Other requirements:

16. Undergraduate Majors:

List fields undergraduate majors are offered in:

Five most popular undergraduate majors:

17. Degrees Awarded:

Types of degrees awarded (e.g., B.A., B.S., M.A., etc.)

Number of degrees awarded, by type of degree:
Bachelor's:
Masters:
First Professional:
Ph.D.
Other:

18. Graduation Rates and Retention Statistics:

Percent of entering freshmen who return for their sophomore year:
Percent of entering freshmen who graduate four years later:
Percent of entering freshmen who graduate five years later:
Percent of entering freshmen who graduate six years later:

19. Post-Graduation Activities of Graduating Seniors:

Percent of graduating seniors who, within one year of graduating, entered:
Graduate school:
Medical school :
Law school:
Business school:
Went elsewhere:

[NB: These figures are not available for the Berkeley campus.]

20. Housing:

A. Campus Housing Policies:

[Detail campus housing policies regarding on and off-campus housing.]

B. University-Operated Housing:

University-operated housing and spaces available:
Single-sex dormitories:
Co-ed dormitories:
Theme houses focused on a specific language or culture:
Family Housing:
Other:

Percent of freshmen who live in campus housing:

Percent of all undergraduates who live in campus housing:

C. Sororities and Fraternities:

Number of sororities:
Number undergraduate women who live in sororities:

Number of fraternities:
Number of undergraduate men who live in fraternities:

D. Types and spaces available in other housing:

Student cooperatives:
International Student Housing:
Other:

21. Library Holdings:

Number of book titles:
Number of current serial publications:
Number of manuscripts:
Number of titles on microform:
Number of maps:
Number of sound recordings (e.g.,records, tapes, CD's, CD-ROM's):
On-line bibliographic service:
Other:

22. Computer Facilities:

Location of microcomputers or terminals for general student use (e.g., dormitories, libraries, classrooms, comoputer center, etc.)

Freshmen required to lease or purchase a microcomputer:

Which of the following services are available:
On-line class registration:
Electronic mail:
Library catalog:
Connection to mainframe:
Other:

23. Special Facilities on Campus:

Describe special facilities, such as museums, botanical gardens, playhouses, auditoriums, film archives, etc. on campus.

24. Honorary Academic Groups:

List the national honor societies available (e.g., Honor Students Society, Phi Beta Kappa, Prytanean, Mortar Board, Golden Key, and Tau Beta Pi).

25. Special Academic Programs:

Which of the following special academic programs are available:

Accelerated Programs
Advanced Placement Credit
Cooperative Education
Cross-registration with other schools
Double major
Dual degrees
Dual enrollment of high school students
External degree program
Independent (student-designed) majors
Independent Study
Internships
Pass-Fail grading option
Placement tests
ROTC
Study Abroad
Teacher Certification
Washington Semester
Other:

26. Student Services:

A. Learning Center:

Are special services available to students with learning disabilities?

If so, give name, title, address and telephone number for contact person:

B. Disabled Students:

Are special services available for physically disabled students, visually impaired students, hearing impaired students, or students with speech and communication difficulties?

If so, give name, title, address and telephone number for contact person:

C. Health Services:

Are health services available for students on campus?

If so, give name, title, address and telephone number for contact person:

E. Counseling and Psychological Services:

Are counseling and psychological services available for students on campus?

If so, give name, title, address and telephone number for contact person:

F. Veterans' Service Unit:

Are special services available for students who are veterans?

If so, give name, title, address and telephone number for contact person:

G. Career Planning and Placement Center:

Are career planning and placement services provided on campus?

If so, give name, title, address and telephone number for contact person:

27. Student Groups:

Number of registered student groups on campus:

Types of groups available (e.g: academic and professional, ethnic, cultural, political and social action, recreational, religious and service-oriented groups, student publications):

28. Athletics and Recreation:

A. Intercollegiate Athletics:

Name of NCAA division:

Number of intercollegiate sports on campus:
Percent of all students who participate in intercollegiate athletics:

Intercollegiate sports available for men:
Sports offering men athletic scholarships:

Intercollegiate sports available for women:
Sports offering women athletic scholarships:

B. Intramural Sports Program:

Number of students who participate in intramural sports:

Number of sports available:

Types of sports available to men:

Types of sports available to women:

C. Athletic and Recreational Facilities on Campus:

Describe the athletic facilities available on campus.

30. Campus Policies:

A. Physical Safety:

Describe the physical safety programs on campus. If available, enclose brochure.

B. Sexual Harrassment:

Describe campus policy on sexual harassment. If available, enclose a copy of the policy.

C. Non-Discrimination:

Describe campus policy on non-discrimination. If available, enclose a copy of the policy.

D. Student Conduct:

Describe campus policy on student conduct. If available, enclose a copy of the policy.